

2. SEP  
22649

*Ac. alc.*

JUN 10 1889  
Theological Series

# ESSAYS

ON

## PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM

BY

VARIOUS WRITERS.

No. 4.

## PENTATEUCH ANALYSIS

BY

PROFESSOR WILLIAM H. GREEN, D.D.

---

NEW YORK :  
FUNK & WAGNALLS,  
18 & 20 ASTOR PLACE,  
1888.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1887, by  
FUNK & WAGNALLS,  
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington, D. C.

PRESS OF  
FUNK & WAGNALLS.  
18 and 20 Astor Place,  
NEW YORK

## SUMMARY.

The investigation necessarily minute. Critical symbols. The burden of proof on the critics. A sense not to be imposed on isolated paragraphs at variance with their context. Evasions by means of the Redactor and by minute subdivisions of the text.

The portion to be discussed. Section first. Exodus 3 and 6:2ff. not duplicate narratives of the same event. The argument thence drawn for the divisive hypothesis illusive. Gaps and omissions in P's narrative. The argument from diction. Perplexity in separating J and E.

Section second. Alleged criteria. The resulting division. Its bearing on the historical truth of the events. The criteria fallacious. Various length of the accounts of the plagues. Diction. The plague of blood. Progress not intermittent when the true scheme of the plagues is seen. The critical hypothesis beset by insuperable difficulties.



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2013

<http://archive.org/details/estateu00gree>

## PENTATEUCHAL ANALYSIS.

In the limited space allowed in these essays it is impossible to undertake the full discussion of the critical division of the Pentateuch in all its length and breadth, to which such a multitude of volumes has been devoted, and upon which so many learned dissertations have been written. A treatment of this subject in general terms would be of no practical benefit. Critical partition is professedly based on the minute examination of paragraphs, words and phrases, and cannot be met by generalities, but only by a similarly minute investigation, in which the arguments adduced in its favour can be rebutted in detail and the opposing considerations, which show it to be unreasonable or impracticable, can likewise be exhibited. Such an investigation must from the nature of the case be tedious, and task the patience of the reader. But it is inevitable, if effective work is to be done, or any intelligent comprehension of the subject is to be gained; for the region in which the discussion moves is the minutiae of diction, style, conception and the connection of paragraphs and sentences, which are only redeemed from their apparently petty character by the momentous consequences deduced from them or dependent on them. The work of the critic is the cross-examination of witnesses, which busies itself with trivial circumstances aside from the leading features of

the testimony. But it is precisely by its coherence in these minor and incidental matters, or by the lack of it, that its credibility and value on the whole are to be tested. We do not object to the searching character of this critical investigation. Our only demand is that it should be fairly and honestly conducted.

The Pentateuch, which to ordinary readers seems to be one continuous production, resolves itself upon close examination, we are told, into three or four treatises or documents giving every indication of distinct authorship, which must in the first instance have existed separately, but have been subsequently woven together. These are technically denoted by the symbols E (Elohism), J (Jahvist), D (Deuteronomist), P (Priestly Narrator). J and E were first combined by a Redactor (Rj), and the united work JE, after circulating for some time, was further enlarged by other Redactors, Rd and Rp, who added Deuteronomy and the Priestly Document. And thus by successive steps the work reached its present compass.

An obvious remark at the outset is that the existence of these documents and redactors is purely a matter of critical discovery. There is no evidence of their existence and no pretence of any apart from the critical tests which have determined the analysis. All tradition and all historical testimony as to the origin of the Pentateuch are against them. The burden of proof lies wholly upon the critics. And this proof should be clear and convincing in proportion to the gravity

and the revolutionary character of the consequences which it is proposed to base upon it.

It is further obvious that the composite character of the Pentateuch, supposing this were established, would not justify the critics in attributing a different sense to the documents in their original form from that which the passages extracted from them are capable of having in their present connection, or in assuming a conflict between them which does not exist as they now stand. The critics have no right upon their own principles to impeach needlessly and arbitrarily the integrity and capacity of the Redactors. The Redactors by the hypothesis had the documents before them separate and complete, with every opportunity to ascertain their true meaning; and it ought not to be assumed without clear proof that this has been obscured or falsified. Modern critics, who possess only the commingled and dislocated fragments that have been preserved to us, are far more likely to be mistaken. If new meanings may be imposed upon paragraphs or sentences incompatible with their present context; if variance may be created by expunging explanatory or harmonizing clauses; if discrepancy may be inferred from a silence which is itself produced by first removing the very statements that are desiderated from the connection; if what are narrated as distinct events may be converted into irreconcilable accounts of the same transaction, the most closely connected composition can be rent asunder into discordant fragments. Such methods are sub-

versive of all just interpretation. The operator imposes his own ideas upon the text before him and draws conclusions which have no warrant but in the flights of his own fancy.

It should also be observed that the insertions, omissions and modifications attributed to the Redactors are merely ingenious methods of evading or explaining away phenomena at variance with the proper requirements of the hypothesis. Wherever it is assumed that the Redactor has altered the characteristic words or phrases of his sources, has modified their language or ideas or inserted expressions and views of his own, the meaning simply is that the facts do not correspond with the hypothesis. The proof relied upon to establish the existence of these otherwise unknown documents is that they are uniformly characterized by a certain diction, style and mode of thought. But inasmuch as they are not always so characterized, they must have been changed by the Redactors. This is building the hypothesis upon the hypothesis and supporting assumption by assumption. It is plain that every alleged interference of the Redactors weakens by so much the evidence on which the hypothesis itself reposes.

Another evasive expedient which naturally creates distrust in critical processes as they are at present conducted, is the minute subdivision to which the Redactors are at times assumed to have resorted in piecing together their sources. It might with a show of reason be claimed that a



judgment can be formed of the authorship of considerable paragraphs and sections from their diction and style. But that individual sentences and clauses can be referred with any certainty to their proper authors, or that a sensible compiler would have constructed his paragraphs like a piece of mosaic from bits and scraps culled alternately from different documents, or that any semblance of continuity could be given to paragraphs so framed, it is not easy to suppose. This simply amounts to a confession that the phenomena cannot be brought into harmony with the hypothesis by any less violent procedure. What the critics reckon to be criteria of distinct writers are found closely conjoined in sections which have every appearance of proceeding from the same pen, but which under the requirements of the hypothesis must be torn to shreds.

The present discussion will be limited to the first eleven chapters of Exodus, which together with chapters 12, 13, whose unity has been sufficiently treated elsewhere,\* cover the entire abode of the children of Israel in Egypt. This is a portion quite long enough to test the hypothesis, and to exhibit its principles and methods, while it is as much as can be brought under review in the space at our command. And it is besides especially suited to our purpose; for the assumption of preexisting documents in Genesis does not stand in such obvious conflict with Mosaic authorship as the extension of this hypothesis into the books that follow.

---

\* The Hebrew Feasts, ch. iii. and iv.

The section proposed for consideration may be divided into two parts: 1. Chapter 1-7:7, the oppression of Israel in Egypt and the preparation of Moses to be a deliverer; 2. 7:8-11:10, the plagues by which Pharaoh's obstinacy was broken and Israel released. In the first part the critics assign to P 1:1-7, 13, 14 (except some words in verses 7, 14, and perhaps verse 6), 2:23<sup>b</sup>-25, 6:2-7:7.

It is alleged that chapter 3 and 6:2ff. are parallel accounts of the same transaction. Everything is duplicated. God twice reveals to Moses his name Jehovah (3:13-15, 6:2, 3), and twice announces to him his purpose to deliver Israel and bring them to Canaan by his instrumentality (3:7-10, 6:6-8, 11), and upon Moses' pleading unfitness Aaron is twice associated with him (4:10-16, 6:30-7:2). The critical hypothesis, it is said, is here explicitly justified. These accounts must be from two different writers, 6:2ff. from P, and chapter 3 from E. This being in the intent of each writer according to the critics the first communication of the name Jehovah, neither of them could have employed this name in the antecedent portion of his narrative. All preceding passages that contain the name Jehovah, must accordingly be by a third writer, J, who had a different view of its origin. A firm basis, it is contended, is thus laid for tracing the record to three distinct sources.

But this is foisting a meaning upon these passages which they plainly will not bear. It is inconsistent, 1. with the repeated occurrence of the

name Jehovah in the antecedent history, showing that the author of the Pentateuch in its present form, whether Moses, or if the critics please, the three Redactors (Rj, Rd and Rp), did not so understand them. 2. With chapter 3 itself. If the author meant that the name Jehovah was first revealed in 3:14, 15 and systematically abstained for that reason from using it before, he could not use it as he does in verses 2, 4, 7. The critics confess this and expunge Jehovah from these verses as an insertion by R, thus reconstructing the text in accordance with their hypothesis. And how could a name previously unheard of assure the children of Israel that Moses had really been commissioned by the God of their fathers (3:13, 15)? 3. With the real meaning of 6:2ff., which is not that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob had never heard the word Jehovah, but that they had had no such experience of what the name involved as was now to be granted to their descendants. God is known by his name Jehovah not by the utterance of the word but by an experience of what it denotes. It is so uniformly throughout the Scriptures, *e.g.*, Isa. 52:6. Jer. 9:24, 16:21, Ezek. 39:6, 7. God's not being known by the patriarchs by his name Jehovah is in evident contrast with the repeated declarations that Israel (6:7, 10:2), the Egyptians (7:5, 14:4, 18), and Pharaoh (7:17, 8:10, 22, 9:14, 29, comp. 5:2), should know that he was Jehovah.

The support which the critics would draw for their hypothesis from Ex. iii. and vi.:2, etc., thus collapses entirely. As these passages do not de-

clare the occasion of the first employment of the name Jehovah, there is no propriety in regarding them as distinct versions of the same event, and thus tracing them to separate writers; nor in holding that they present a different view of the origin of the name Jehovah from those sections of Genesis which employ it from the earliest periods, and are in consequence referred to a third writer.

That chapter iii. and chapter vi. relate different events is as plain as the history can make it. One took place at Horeb, the other in Egypt. They occurred at different times and at distinct stages in God's revelation to Moses; one when Moses was first commissioned, the other after he had, in pursuance of his commission, made a demand upon Pharaoh on the people's behalf which only resulted in increasing their burdens. That under these circumstances the Lord should renew his former assurances to Moses with increased emphasis, that the people should lose the faith (6:9) which they had before (4:31), that Moses, who had distrusted his own qualifications at the beginning (4:10), should now be hopeless of success with Pharaoh (6:12), and that Aaron, who had been appointed to help him with the people (4:16), should now be made his assistant before the king (7:1, 2), is perfectly natural and suggests no suspicion that the story is repeating itself.

The narrative assigned to P is halting at every point from the want of those connecting or explanatory parts which have been sundered from it. The critics violate their own maxim that rep-

etitions give evidence of distinct writers by confessing that the enumeration of Jacob's family (Ex. 1:1-5) can only be an abridgment by P of his own fuller statement Gen. 46:8-27; and their multiplication (Ex. 1:7) had already been stated by him in almost identical terms (Gen. 47:27). From this he leaps quite unaccountably to their oppression by the Egyptians (verses 13, 14), who had so hospitably received them. This needs for its explanation the omitted verses 8-12, in which moreover "more and mightier" רב רעצום (verse 9) is a plain verbal allusion to "multiplied and waxed exceeding mighty" וירבו ויעצמי (verse 7), as is also "multiply" (verses 10, 12), "multiplied and waxed very mighty" (verse 20). In fact verse 7 supplies the keynote of all that follows in the chapter, binding the whole indissolubly together. Verse 9 severed from it is quite unexplained in a writer who had spoken of the descent of Jacob's family into Egypt, but had said nothing of the great increase of his descendants. Verse 6, "And Joseph died," etc., plainly prepares the way for verse 8, the "new king which knew not Joseph." The "mortar and brick" (verse 14) both allude to the building of treasure cities (verse 11), and to the brickmaking of 5:7, etc., which is associated with "burdens" (5:4, 5), as in 1:11, 14. These obvious references by one writer to paragraphs assigned to another are evaded by various feats of critical surgery which have no justification but the necessity created by the hypothesis.

From the account of Egyptian oppression (1:

13, 14) whose meagre baldness is due to its having been rent from its proper place in the series of inflictions of growing severity (verses 11-22), P springs at once to 2:23<sup>b</sup>-25 with its mention of a covenant with Isaac, although none such is recorded except by J (Gen. 26:2-5, 24); and thence to 6:2, etc., where God suddenly speaks to Moses and shortly after (verse 13), to Moses and Aaron, as if they were well-known personages, though there had been no previous mention of their existence. This incongruity, created by the removal of the very account (chapter 2, etc.,) here presupposed, gives rise to new critical assumptions. Kuenen fancies that P had spoken before of Moses and Aaron in some passage which has not been preserved. Kayser gets rid of the allusion to Aaron by referring 6:13-30 to the Redactor. Dillmann declines to do this, but with a like view of finding the first mention of Aaron in 7:1 he transposes 6:30-7:5 before 6:13 and places 7:6 immediately after it. Wellhausen undertakes to supply the missing mention of Moses and Aaron by the conjecture that the account of their ancestry (6:16ff.) may originally have preceded 6:2, though the record of Aaron's wife and children (verse 23, etc.) is in his judgment inappropriate and a later addition. But the appositiveness of the entire genealogy, every clause of which is in analogy with those previously given, appears from the fact that it not only introduces Aaron and Moses, who are just entering upon the momentous task assigned them, but likewise Korah, Nadab, Abihu,



Eleazar, Ithamar and Phinehas, who are to figure in the subsequent history. Nöldeke confesses the suitability of the table in general, but stumbles at the sons of Reuben and Simeon (verses 14, 15) as here uncalled for, and in his opinion an interpolation. Jülicher very properly replies that an interpolator would not have stopped with inserting these two names only, when there was equal reason for adding all the rest of Jacob's sons. In fact there is a suitability in verses 14, 15 standing where they do to indicate Levi's place as the third in age in his father's family. Jülicher proposes to relieve the suddenness of the mention of Moses in 6:2 by transposing before it the entire genealogy with 6:13 as its title, which will thus connect directly with 2:25; although this would place "Jehovah" in 6:13 prior to what he considers the first revelation of this name in 6:2, 3. But after all this self-imposed trouble and these fruitless conjectures of the critics, it is difficult to see why the reasons, be what they may, which led the imaginary Redactor to give to this whole passage its present position, may not have been equally influential with the original writer. This busy tinkering betokens merely a weak spot, which needs in some way to be covered up.

It is urged that 6:2ff. would connect well with 2:23-25, to which its language contains manifest allusions—"heard the groaning," "children of Israel," "remembered my covenant," "bondage," "Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." But each of these passages connects perfectly with its present con-

text. And while there is an obvious and designed relationship between them, they need not on that account have been contiguous. On the other hand, it is perfectly plain that 2:23-25 is bound in the closest manner to the immediately following chapter, which must have proceeded from the same pen, and cannot possibly have been from a different writer and independently conceived, as the critics would have us suppose. God's appearance to Moses (chapter 3) and the message which he gives him flow directly from 2:23-25, which shapes the expressions used, *e. g.*, the motive drawn from God's relation to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (3:6, 15), God saw, heard and knew (3:7), (precisely as 2:24, 25 where A. V. "looked upon" is in Heb. "saw," and "had respect unto" is in Heb. "knew"), the cry (תַּעֲזָב, 2:23 וַעֲזָב) of the children of Israel came unto God (3:7, 9).

In 6:6-8 the criteria of the different writers are sadly mixed; "bondage," "stretched out arm," "judgments," which belong to P are combined with "burdens," "rid," "bring into the land," and God's swearing to give the land, of which lifting the hand is the significant gesture, elsewhere attributed to J or E. Among the phrases counted as P's are "of uncircumcised lips" (6:12, 30), which occurs nowhere else, and can therefore be no criterion of style; groaning (2:24, 6:5), and nowhere else in the Pentateuch; "Pharaoh king of Egypt" (6:11, 13, 27, 29), which is also found (Gen. 41:46) in JE; God remembering (6:5), but also (Gen. 30:22, Ex. 32:13) in JE; "wonders"



(7:3), but also (4:21) in JE; "armies" or hosts (6:26, 7:4), but also (Gen. 21:22, 32, 26:26) in JE; and though it does not chance to be applied to Israel, other expressions are used suggesting the same conception; "judgments" (6:6, 7:4), and but twice elsewhere in the Pentateuch; "bring forth my people, the children of Israel" (7:4), as 3:10 E.

But the most striking words and phrases of this passage are drawn from Gen. 17:1, 7, 8, which it reproduces almost completely, "appeared to Abraham," "God Almighty," "establish my covenant," "give the land of Canaan," "land of their pilgrimage," "I will be to you a God." And in almost every instance in which these same expressions are found elsewhere, they are directly and obviously traceable to this one source. They cannot properly be urged, therefore, as characteristics of style. They simply show familiarity with the passage upon which they are all alike based. The critics nevertheless use them as criteria; and every passage that contains them is for that reason, wherever it is at all practicable, assigned to P. And yet "God Almighty" is confessedly found in J (Gen. 43:14), and "Almighty" in Gen. 49:25. The phrase "establish a covenant" suggests its perpetuity. It is accordingly used only of God's covenants and chiefly of those with Noah and Abraham, when prominence was to be given to the idea of their permanence. The alternate phrase attributed to J, "make (H**eb.** *cut*) a covenant," is equally applicable to those of men, and

is used of a divine covenant only when the thought is directed to its ratification, especially if that was solemnized, as in Gen. 15:18, Ex. 24:8, by sacrificial rites. Comp. Ps. 50:5. "Land of Canaan," according to Kayser, occurs in JE no less than fifteen times in the book of Genesis. "Pilgrimage" (or wherein he was a stranger) is found six times in Genesis, and is in every instance referred to P. "I will be to you a God" is here associated with a phrase, "I will take you to me for a people," which occurs nowhere else in P.

The result so far as concerns the passages assigned to P is this: The critics sunder a few verses from their present connection in which they fit perfectly well, and omitting the intervening sections, they claim that these verses were originally continuous. But the omissions leave gaps unfilled and confuse events shown to be distinct by recorded differences of place and circumstances, needlessly assuming discrepancies which are wholly created by these critical processes, and imputing incapacity or fraud to the Redactor or the author of the book in its present form. And that the characteristic diction which is the principal plea urged for this critical dissection is not such as to warrant it, appears from the occasional intermingling of the criteria of different documents, from the fact that some of the alleged criteria are of so rare occurrence as to be no evidence of style; that others exhibit conformity to sundry other paragraphs simply because all are alike drawn from one fundamental passage; and

others still are not peculiar to P, but found in what is ascribed to J or E as well.

After removing P's share of 1:1-7:7, the critics are not a little perplexed in their attempt to parcel the remainder between J and E.\* Kayser thinks it impossible to disentangle the two accounts without breaking the connection. Kuenen confesses that "here we cannot separate two distinct documents and assign its share to each with confidence. The most we can hope for is to determine whether it is E or J that lies at the basis of the narrative; and sometimes even this is doubtful." Wellhausen gives to J 1:8-10 because of its resemblance to Gen. 11:6, 7, thus depriving the oppression 1:11, 12 in E of its motive; also verses 20*b*, 22, making this barbarous edict the very first expedient instead of a desperate resort after all other attempts had failed, and sundering it from

\* WELLHAUSEN.

J. 1:6, 8-10, 20*b*, 22; 2:11-23*a*; 3:1-9, 16-20; 4:1-12, [13-16], 18, 20*a*, 24-26, 27-31; 5:1-6:1.

E. 1:11, 12, 15-20*a*, 21; 2:1-10; 3:10-15, 21, 22; 4:17, 19, 20*b*, 21-23.

Modified by R. 3:4, 6, 9, 21, 22; 4:17, 27-30.

DILLMANN.

J. 2:15-23*a*; 4:1-16, 19, 20*a* [22, 23 transposed from elsewhere], 24-29*a*, 30, 31*a*, *c*.

E. Chapter 3 (verses 2\*, 4\*, 7\*, 8\*, 17\*, 22\*); 4:17, 18, 20*b*, 21, 29*b*, 31*b*; chapter 5 (verses 1\*, 2\*, 4\*, 5\*, 6\*, 9\*, 10\*, 11*b*\*, 13\*, 14\*, 15\*, 19\*, 20\*, 21\*-23\*).

The verses marked with an asterisk have been modified by the Redactor.

JULICHER.

J. 2:23*a*; 4:19, 20*a*, 24-26; 3:7, 8, 16-22; 4:1-12, 29, 30*b*, 31; 5:3, 4, 6-21, 22, 23; 6:1.

E. 1:8-12, 15-22; 2:1-21; 3:1-6, 9-14; 4:17, 18, 20*b*; 5:1, 2, 5.

R. 1:20; 2:22, 25; 3:15; 4:13-16, 21-23, 27, 28, 30*a*.

E's account of Moses' infancy (2: 1-10), which presupposes it throughout. Dillmann, Schrader and Jülicher avoid these incongruities by excluding J from chapter 1 altogether.

That Moses' parents are spoken of indefinitely in 2: 1 while the line of his descent is accurately traced in 6: 10 is no proof of diversity of authors, one of whom had more exact information than the other. The precise statement was purposely reserved for the supreme crisis in Moses' life, and the new period in Israel's history thus opened as the most fitting place for his genealogy in accordance with the plan of the Pentateuch. Wellhausen is alone in the attempt, which after all he confesses to be impracticable, to sunder 2: 1-10 into two inconsistent stories, one of which knows nothing of an older sister of Moses, nor of his mother being engaged as nurse.

Schrader fancies an inconsistency in the motive for Moses' flight (verse 14 and verse 15), and so assigns 2: 1-14 to E and verses 15-23a to J. Dillmann admits that no such inconsistency exists, but retains the same division, thus connecting verses 11-14 with verses 1-10, to which verse 11 evidently alludes. Wellhausen, on the other hand, connects them with verses 15-23a, and verse 15 is unintelligible without them. In fact both are right; verses 11-14 link the whole chapter together, being alike firmly bound to what precedes and to what follows; and so Jülicher confesses, who refers 2: 1-22 to E, as the allusions in 18: 3, 4 E to 2: 15, 22 further require. But in giving

verse 23*a* to J, he severs it from verse 15, to which it manifestly alludes.

While attributing the story of Moses' birth and infancy to E and his residence in Midian to J, the critics nevertheless confess that J and E must alike have recorded both. E must have had a section similar to that which is imputed to J, and J must have had one similar to that of E. So that after the narrative has been sundered in twain, it is straightway necessary to assume that each part originally had just such a complement as has been severed from it.

In chapters 3-5 it is once more assumed that J and E had parallel accounts which have been interwoven in the most intricate manner. Dillmann derives chapters 3 and 5 from E, though with modifications from R in almost every verse. Wellhausen derives chapter 5 and 3:1-9, 16-20 from J and Julicher also from J nearly the whole of chapter 5 together with 3:7, 8, 16-22. Dillmann assigns 3:1 to J in distinction from 2:18 E, because the Reuel of the latter is in the former called Jethro. These verses are alike attributed to J by Wellhausen and to E by Jülicher, on the assumption that the name Reuel was a subsequent addition, and in the opinion of Wellhausen Jethro likewise. But this interchange of names warrants no critical conclusions whatever, the simple explanation being that Reuel is his proper name, and Jethro, as Clericus long since observed, his official designation; so that there is no more mystery

in the case than in the substitution of "Pharaoh" for "king of Egypt" (1: 18, 19).

Wellhausen admits that 3: 1-4: 17 creates the impression of "a piece from one casting." The critics, however, insist that there is an incongruity implying diversity of authorship between 4: 19 (J) Moses' return to Egypt by immediate divine direction and verse 18 (E), his previous resolution to go with Jethro's permission. In verses 20*a*, 24-26 (J) he takes his family with him evidently intending to remain, whereas verse 18 (E) merely contemplates his going alone on a brief visit and chapter 18 (E) his wife and children remained with Jethro, where verse 2*b*, "after he had sent her back," is regarded as a harmonizing interpolation by R. In 4: 17, 20*b* (E) "this rod" and "the signs" (with the article in Heb.) seem in their present connection to refer to verses 1-9 (J); but the rod was there used in only one sign, and then not as an instrument but as the object wrought upon. The conclusion is thence drawn that the allusion is not to verses 1-9, but to some narrative now lost in which a miraculous rod was given to Moses with directions regarding the signs to be wrought by it. Again the signs in verses 1-9 were to be exhibited before the people (verses 1, 5), while verse 21 (E) speaks of "wonders before Pharaoh," and of his return to Egypt as yet future, whereas in verse 20*a* (J) he had already returned.

Chapter 4: 10-12, recording Moses' reluctance and God's promise to be with his mouth, is assign-



ed to J. With this Wellhausen and Jülicher regard the appointment of Aaron to be his spokesman as incompatible; they therefore eject verses 13-16 as a later addition, notwithstanding the identical phrases, "O, my Lord" (verses 10, 13) and the coincidences in verses 12, 15. Consistency then obliges them to trace verses 27, 28 to Rj, and to attribute to the same source the insertion of Aaron's name in verses 29-31 (J,) so as to make it appear that in J's original account it was Moses who spake to the people and performed the signs. Dillmann sets all this aside by pointing out that verses 13-16 do not annul but confirm verse 12. God promises to be with Moses' mouth as well as with Aaron's, and Aaron is associated with Moses, not substituted for him. There is consequently no discrepancy and no need of assuming an interpolation, whether of these verses or of verses 27, 28, or an unauthorized insertion of Aaron's name. But as Dillmann imputes 3: 18 to E (contrary to Wellh. and Jül.), and thence infers that E speaks of the elders and J of Aaron, verses 29-31 are sliced accordingly. Parts of verses 29, 31 are assigned to E, viz., "he gathered all the elders of the children of Israel; . . . and they heard that Jehovah had visited the children of Israel and that he had looked upon their affliction;" and the remainder to J. From all which it appears how easy it is for a critic to manipulate or sunder the text in accordance with a preconceived theory, be that what it may.

The discrepancies alleged in this chapter are so

manifestly of the critics' own making that it seems a needless waste of words to refute them. After Moses had been commissioned to deliver Israel, 3: 1-4: 17, he obtained Jethro's permission to return to Egypt, ver. 18. Whereupon the Lord confirms his resolution by the encouraging information of the death of those who sought his life, ver. 19. This had been before communicated to the reader, 2: 23*a*, but Moses did not know it until now. The explanatory remark 18: 2*b* showing the consistency of the narrative is rejected by the critics as an interpolation, without the slightest authority and contrary to all reason, for the mere sake of creating a contradiction where none exists. The rod, 4: 17, as is plain from 7: 15, is that of 4: 2-4, and the signs are those—whether heretofore described or not—which were to be wrought by its instrumentality, in the presence both of the people and of Pharaoh. The preliminary statement that Moses returned to the land of Egypt is made at the outset, ver. 20, before detailing the occurrences on the way, just as the comprehensive statement is made, 7: 6, that Moses and Aaron did, as the Lord commanded them, prior to the detailed narrative which extends through this and the subsequent chapters.

The section 7: 8-11: 10 is acknowledged to show a regular progression in the severity and effectiveness of the plagues described until they reach their awful climax in the death of the first-born and the deliverance of Israel. It is nevertheless affirmed that it yields to critical analysis,



and that by following suggestions furnished by the preceding chapters it can be separated into three constituents. P makes Aaron the prophet of Moses, 7: 1, insists on letting the children of Israel go unconditionally, 6: 11, 7: 2, and declares that Jehovah will lead forth his people in spite of Pharaoh's continued refusal, 7: 5. J and E make Moses the speaker before the king, 4: 22; he only asks permission to hold a feast in the wilderness, 5: 1, 3, and Pharaoh shall himself drive the people out of his land, 6: 1. According to E. 4: 17, but not J, the miracles were to be wrought by Moses with his rod.

Guided by these criteria the critics resolve the plagues as follows.\* In P Aaron with his rod works the miracles. These are conceived of not as plagues inflicted on the Egyptians so much as exhibitions of power, with which the sorcerers vie with partial success at first but to their final discomfiture. P uses a fixed form with regularly recurring phrases, "Jehovah spake unto Moses, Say unto Aaron Stretch out thy rod, etc., that there may be, etc. And they did so. And Aaron stretched out his rod, etc., and there was, etc. And the magician's did so with their enchantments, etc. And Pharaoh's heart was hardened, and he hearkened not unto them, as Jehovah had said."

In J Moses goes to Pharaoh and demands that he should let the people go to serve Jehovah, and threatens him, in case of refusal, with a particular plague mostly at a fixed time. This is inflicted

---

\*For Note see next page.

by Jehovah without any human instrumentality. Thereupon the king commonly summons Moses and Aaron—the latter being simply the companion of Moses—and asks their intercession, promising to let the people go. Moses consents to intercede, mostly designating an interval be-

## \* WELLHAUSEN.

P. 7 : 8-13, (1) 7 : 19, 20*a*, 21*c*, 22, 23 (2) 8 : 5-7, 15*b*, (3) 8 : 16-19 (6) 9 : 8-12, 11 : 9, 10.

J. (1) 7 : 14-18, (2) 7 : 25, 8 : 1-4, 8-15*a*, (4) 8 : 20-32, (5) 9 : 1-7, (7) 9 : 13-21, 22\*-25\*, 26-34, (8) 10 : 1\*-11, 13*b*, 14*b*, 15\*-19, (9) 10 : 28, 29, 11 : 4-8.

E. (1) 7 : 17*b*, 20*b*, 21*a*, *b*, 24, (7) 9 : 22\*-24\*, 35, (8) 10 : 12, 13*a*, 14*a*, 15\*, 20, (9) 10 : 21-27, 11 : 1-3.

## DILLMANN.

P. 7 : 8-13, (1) 7 : 19, 20*a*, 21*b*, 22, (2) 8 : 5-7, 15*b*, (3) 8 : 16-19, (6) 9 : 8-12, 11 : 9, 10.

J. (1) 7 : 14-17*a*, 25, (2) 8 : 1-4, 8-15*a*, (4) 8 : 20*b*-22, 23*b*, 24, 28*b*, 29*a*, 30-32, (5) 9 : 1-7, (7) 9 : 13, 17-21, 23*b*, 24*b*, 25*a*, 26-30, 33, 34, (8) 10 : 1-7, 13*bc*, 14*b*, 15*a*, 16-19, (9) 10 : 28, 29, 11 : 4-8.

E. (1) 7 : 15\*, 17*b*, 18, 20*b*, 21*a*, 23, 24 (4) 8 : 20*a*, 23*a*, 25-28*a*, 29*b*, (7) 9 : 13\*, 22, 23*a*, 24*a*, 25*b*, 31, 32, 35 (8) 10 : 8-12, 13*a*, 14*a*, 15*bc*, 20 (9) 10 : 21-27, 11 : 1-3.

R. 9 : 14-16.

## JULICHER.

P. 7 : 8-13, (1) 7 : 19, 20*a*, 21*b*, 22, (2) 8 : 5-7, 15*b*, (3) 8 : 16-19, (6) 9 : 8-12, 11 : 9, 10.

J. (1) 7 : 14-17*a*, (15*b*\*, 17\*), 23, 25*b* (2) 8 : 1-4, 8\*-14 (12\*) (4) 8 : 20-32 (22*b*\*, 23\*, 25\*, 26\*, 27\*), (5) 2 : 1-7, (7) 9 : 13, 17, 18, 23*b*, 24\*, 25\*, 26, 27\*, 28\*, 29\*, 31-33\*, 34\*, (8) 10 : 1*a*, 3\*-6*a*, 13*bc*, 14*b*, 15*ac*, 16\*-19, 11 : 4-8.

E. (1) 7 : 17*b*, 18, 20*b*, 21, 24, 25*a*, (7) 9 : 22, 23*a*, 24\*, 28\*, 30, 35*a*, (8) 10 : 7, 8-13*a*, 14*a*, 15*b*, (9) 10 : 21-29, 11 : 1-3.

R. 9 : 14-16, 19-21, 29*b*, 30, 35*b*, 10 : 1*b*, 2, 6*b*.

The figures enclosed in parentheses represent the different plagues in their order. (1) blood, (2) frogs, (3) lice, (4) flies, (5) murrain, (6) boils, (7) hail, (8) locusts, (9) darkness.

forehand, and at the appointed time the plague is removed. In some of the plagues a distinction is expressly made between Israel and Egypt.

In E, which is much more fragmentary than the others, the miracles are wrought by the rod of Moses, and after particular plagues Pharaoh makes greater and greater concessions.

Upon this scheme no one of the narrators has recorded all the plagues. P only four, J six, E four or five. All these unite upon one (blood); two on four (P and J frogs; J and E flies, hail, locusts). Of the four remaining, two (lice, boils) are peculiar to P, one (murrain) to J, and one (darkness) to E. Whence it is inferred that these different traditions agreed that certain extraordinary events preceded and facilitated the exodus; but they were not agreed as to what these events were. The gravity of the conclusion makes it important that we should examine with some care the basis upon which it rests.

It requires but a moment's inspection to see that the alleged diversities, which are made the criteria of the different writers, and are urged in justification of the proposed severance, do not exist. Thus the alleged superior prominence of Aaron in P is groundless. Precisely the same function is assigned to him 4:14-16 (J) as in 7:2 (P). According to 4:30 (J) "Aaron spake the words which the Lord had spoken to Moses and did the signs"—the very criterion by which the critics propose to distinguish P. So in 5:1 (E) Moses and Aaron go in and speak to Pharaoh.

Here, as in other passages assigned to JE where the two brothers are combined, the critics summarily eject "Aaron" from the text for no reason but to adapt it better to their hypothesis. Moses was directed, 3:18 (E), to take the elders with him to the king. This is no warrant, however, for substituting the elders for Aaron in 5:1, confirmed as the latter is by verses 4. 20. It simply shows that the writer was not painfully precise in stating everything in so many words which could be readily enough inferred from what he had said previously. Moreover Aaron did not work all the miracles which the critics ascribe to P. Not to speak of the plague of the firstborn (12:12) which was inflicted by Jehovah without human agency, the boils were produced not by Aaron's rod, but by Moses sprinkling ashes toward heaven (9:8, 10); so that by the confession of the critics the miracles recorded by the same writer need not all be wrought by an absolutely uniform method. It is purely arbitrary, therefore, on their own principles, to refer 9:22, 23, 10:12, 13, 21, 22 to a different writer from 7:19, 8:5, 6, 16, 17, where the expressions are identical even to the remarkable interchange of "hand" and "rod," only the actor is Moses instead of Aaron. In 11:10 P ascribes the miracles to the agency of Moses as well as Aaron.

Besides, if the letter of 7:2, 3 be pressed, no mention is there made of Aaron as concerned in working miracles. God says that He will himself multiply his signs and wonders (the very feature

attributed to J), while Aaron is simply to speak to Pharaoh. Express mention is made (10:3, 8) (J) of Aaron as joined with Moses in speaking to Pharaoh, which, coupled with the fact that the king was in the habit of summoning both the brothers to an interview, makes it probable that whenever Moses is said to have spoken to Pharaoh the meaning is that he did so through the medium of Aaron. But however this may be, if we accept the division made by the critics, P never represents either Moses or Aaron as uttering a word to Pharaoh. A series of miracles is wrought with no other object apparently than to see whether Aaron can outdo Pharaoh's jugglers. It is repeated time after time that Pharaoh's heart was hardened, and he hearkened not unto them. But what they had said or to what Pharaoh refused to listen does not appear. Jülicher makes himself merry over P's description, which he likens to a tournament with its successive feats at arms, and in which no regard is had to time or place. Moses and Aaron remain in the presence of the king from beginning to end, whether in the palace or the open air is not said, only once running into a neighboring house for some ashes, the miracles crowding one upon another in quick succession till all are ended. He seems quite unconscious that his ridicule really falls upon the absurd division which the critics have made of a narrative that is perspicuous and well ordered throughout.

The alleged difference in the demand made upon Pharaoh in P and in J and E is also without

foundation, as is evident from what has just been said. P records no demand whatever upon Pharaoh in even a single instance. That the king's unreasonable obstinacy might be set in the strongest light, no more is ever asked of him than to let Israel go for three days in the wilderness to sacrifice to Jehovah. This is stated fully in the first interview (5:1, 3), but commonly in the briefer form "let my people go, that they may serve me" (8:1). Every such application to Pharaoh is without exception referred either to J or E, and an attempt made to establish a difference in their phraseology—as though J said "serve" and E "sacrifice," or "hold a feast"—which can only be carried through by assuming that wherever the wrong word is used it has been altered by R. As no passage is allowed to P in which Moses and Aaron address the king on this subject there is no material for comparison. The reason why the limited form of the request is nowhere found in P is simply because every paragraph or clause in which it is expressed or implied is for that reason declared not to belong to him. To be sure, Moses and Aaron are directed in P to speak to Pharaoh to let Israel go out of his land (6:11, 7:2, comp. 11:10), but the form of expression is precisely parallel to 7:14 J. And that it was the divine intention from the outset to effect Israel's absolute release is as plain from what is attributed to J and E (3:8, 10, 19, 20), as from anything contained in P.

And that Pharaoh, constrained by God's strong



hand, should drive Israel out of his land (6:1, JE) is not inconsistent with P's declaration (7:4) that Pharaoh should refuse to hearken, and that the Lord would bring forth Israel out of Egypt by great judgments. JE gives the solution 3:19, 20. The design of the judgments was to break Pharaoh's obstinacy and compel his stout heart to yield. And P nowhere affirms that at the critical moment of Israel's departure they had failed to accomplish this end.

The basis on which the critics professedly rest their analysis thus fails them at every point.

The space devoted to different plagues varies considerably; and it has been urged that this indicates the composite character of the narrative. But this argument is of no avail for the critics, for the disparity continues after they have made their partition. Murrain (J) and darkness (E) have in all but seven verses each; while after E and R have each had their share Dillmann still reserves fifteen verses for J in the account of the hail, and thirteen in that of the locusts. It is further observable that the attendant circumstances and the dealings with Pharaoh are assigned to JE, while P is limited to the bare record of the plague itself. This is an unwarranted sundering of what belongs together, and is only properly intelligible in connection.

Scarcely any account is made of diction in dividing this section; and, as it would appear, with good reason, for what is urged is meagre enough. P uses the term "wonders" (7:3, 9, 11:9, 10), but

so does E (4:21); and "pool" (7:19), which occurs but twice besides in the whole Pentateuch. P says "hearken to," J "hearken to the voice of." "Magicians," though in Genesis used by E, is here ascribed to A. Three words are employed to denote the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, which vary slightly in signification, קשה hard or obdurate, חזק stout or obstinate, כבד heavy, hard to move or stubborn. These are used in both intransitive and transitive forms, and the latter with the Lord or Pharaoh himself as subjects. Strenuous endeavours have been made to parcel these in some distinctive way among the different writers; but with all the liberties that the critics have allowed themselves, they have not been very successful as yet.

In 8:15 J's phrase "hardened his heart" and P's "hearkened not unto them" occur together; and instead of drawing the natural conclusion that one writer used both phrases the critics split the sentence and divide it between J and P. Two different words for "hardening" occur after the plague of hail (9:34, 35), one transitive attributing it to Pharaoh's own agency, the other intransitive. Instead of admitting that the same writer has here used both words, the critics isolate the second verse from its context and seek for it some other connection. The same thing is done with 10:20, where the wrong word occurs for the theory. The theory rules, and the text is remodelled to correspond.

And after all the only result attained is that J



always uses כֶּבֶד, and yet even he interchanges the adjectives כֶּבֶד and הֹק (10:14, 19); P and E alike make use of הֹק and that in both its transitive and intransitive forms; and P uses both הֹק and קֶשֶׁה. If two of these supposititious writers employ the same word to express this idea, and one of them uses two distinct words for the purpose, why is it not quite as easy to suppose that the same writer has, for the sake of varying the expression of a thought so frequently repeated, employed all three of the terms? The theory neither explains nor simplifies the matter, and is not worth the pains that are taken to carry it consistently through.

P has a different word for "serpent" (7:9, 10, 12) from that of J (4:3). The critics find here two versions of the same story, which J locates in the desert and P at the court of Pharaoh. In Dillmann's opinion the latter is the original form of the incident, while Jülicher is equally confident that the former is its proper place. They are both right; each occurrence was appropriate to the occasion on which it is related. And it is not unlikely that the new application of the miracle suggested the altered term, so that the ordinary word for serpent was replaced by one less usual, which may possibly have had special appositeness to Egypt, or to the arts of serpent charmers. Enough is not known of the usage of the word to verify this conjecture; but it is more plausible surely than the critical assumption that it is an unmeaning characteristic of style.

According to Knobel and Schrader, P's account of the first plague, the change of water to blood, is found in 7: 19-22. But if that be so, one of the discrepancies insisted on between P and JE ceases to exist. It is said that P represents all the water in the land of Egypt as turned to blood, while JE limits this to the water of the river. But while verse 19 speaks of streams and rivers and ponds and pools and even the water in vessels of wood and stone as converted into blood, verse 20 lays stress only upon the water of the river, and verse 21 speaks of the fish dying in the river and the impossibility of drinking the water of the river. Noldeke and Kayser, therefore, assign these last two verses which occur in the midst of P's statement to JE, with the exception of the first clause of verse 20, "And Moses and Aaron did so as the LORD commanded." Dillmann and Wellhausen do the same, only they except in addition the last clause of verse 21, "And there was blood throughout all the land of Egypt."

The last named critics further undertake to separate J from E. They call attention to the sudden change of speaker in verse 17. In the first clause "I" means Jehovah; in the second clause with no formal indication that another is speaking, "I" as evidently means Moses. This is regarded as indicating a confusion in the text arising from the blending of two accounts. Verses 14 to 17, as far as the words "Behold, I," or "I will smite," belong to J, who attributes the plagues to the immediate agency of God. The remainder of verse

17 and perhaps verse 18 belong to E, who always employs the instrumentality of Moses' rod. E's account recommences verse 20 with the words, "And he (the pronoun is by the critics referred to Moses) lifted up the rod," etc., and continues in verse 21 as far as "water of the river," and finally embraces verses 23, 24. Then verse 25, which speaks of Jehovah smiting the river, is the conclusion of J's account. This partition by Dillmann, from which Wellhausen's varies slightly, is exceedingly ingenious, and accommodated with marvellous skill to the phenomena of these verses. The close verbal correspondence between verses 17*b*, 18 and 20*b*, 21*a*, the correspondence again between verse 19 and 8:5, and the divergence between verses 19 and 20, seem at first sight to recommend it.

But a moment's reflection is sufficient to show that it cannot be correct. 1. The message to Pharaoh (verses 14-18), the direction to Aaron to execute what had been announced to Pharaoh (verse 19), and his doing as he was directed (verse 20), belong together, and are necessary to complete one another. They cannot be assigned to different writers without making each part a disconnected fragment. According to the critics' division J gives no account of the infliction of the plague; and E's portion begins in the middle of a sentence, with no intimation who is speaking or to whom the words are addressed. 2. The verbal correspondence already remarked upon is no argument for the divisive hypothesis, for it is at once ex-

plained if all is from the same writer. The double application of the pronoun "I" in verse 17 obviously arises from the fact that the words are those of Moses (verse 16), who passes from direct citation of the language of Jehovah, to speaking in his own person, as the prophets and other messengers of the Most High so often do. The assumption that it is due to the Redactor's confusing separate sentences imputes a degree of carelessness or stupidity to him that is quite inconceivable. The mention of the rod, so far from being out of place or requiring the assumption of a different writer, is just what verse 15 prepares us to expect. Moses is there told to take in his hand the rod which was turned to a serpent, in order of course to use it in working the miracle. This is particularly perplexing to the critics, for it completely annuls their distinction of J and E. It is in a context belonging to J. It refers explicitly to 4:2, 3, also belonging to J, and of which E knows nothing. And yet it implies a use of the rod characteristic of E and foreign to J. They can only get rid of it, as they rid themselves of everything inconsistent with their hypothesis, by expunging it from the text as an insertion by R.

There is no inconsistency in Moses speaking of smiting the waters, when in fact they were smitten by Aaron at his bidding. Moses simply acts through the instrumentality of Aaron. Nor is there any want of agreement between the command "Take thy rod and stretch out thine hand upon the waters" and the consequent action, "he

lifted up the rod and smote the waters." Stretching out the rod and smiting with the rod are similarly combined (8:16, 17), only there both terms are inserted in each clause, while here the two clauses supplement each other. That the action cannot be severed from the preceding command and assigned to a different writer is further apparent because in that case there would be no detailed statement as in the parallel instances (8:6, 17) of Aaron's doing as he was directed. Nor is there any discrepancy in all the waters of Egypt becoming blood, whereas Moses had simply spoken to Pharaoh of the water of the river. This was singled out as the most conspicuous and important; and so again in recording the fulfillment, which yet proceeds to add that there was blood throughout all the land of Egypt. And the suggestion that the Lord's smiting the river involves a different conception from its waters being changed to blood when smitten by divine direction refutes itself.

The plague of blood thus refuses to yield to the analysis of the critics. They reduce a connected and well arranged narrative to mutilated fragments upon pleas which will not bear examination. With others of the plagues they are less successful still; notably so with those of the hail and locusts. In fact they confess themselves that the analysis cannot be carried through: and the marvellous medley which they make is apparent from the manner in which they riddle the text into bits in their attempt to disentangle J and E.

One plea for the critical partition of the plagues remains to be briefly considered. It is that while there is an evident plan and progress in them in various respects, this is intermittent instead of being continuous throughout. It is commonly conceded that there is a consistent advance in severity from first to last. But the magicians only appear in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 6th. The effect on the king is noted in the 2nd, 4th, 7th, 8th and 9th. The 1st, 2nd and 4th, and especially the 7th and 8th, are related in a diffuse and circumstantial manner, while in other cases the record is briefer and more scanty.

But the complaint arises wholly from the failure to observe the scheme of the whole. The nine plagues preceding the tenth and last are arranged in three series of three each. In the first two members of each series the plague is preannounced to Pharaoh, the first beginning each time with the same identical phrase (7:15, 8:20, 9:13); so the second more briefly (8:1, 9:1, 10:1); in the third no preannouncement is made (8:16, 9:8, 10:20). In the first three the magicians use their enchantments, failing in the third, after which they make no further attempt, and are only mentioned once again in the plague inflicted upon persons, where their discomfiture is completed by their suffering from boils like the rest. From the first member of the second series onward a distinction is made between Egypt and Goshen, where the children of Israel dwelt. In the first series and again in the second the king sent once for



Moses and Aaron to intercede for him in that particular plague which he found personally most distressing; in the last series the unparalleled character of each is specially remarked, and the king sent for Moses and Aaron at each successive plague with increasing urgency. The first series is regularly brought on by Aaron with his rod, the third by Moses with his rod; in the second no rod is mentioned. Other particulars might be noted; but these are sufficient to show that there is a regular scheme consistently carried out from first to last, such as cannot be accounted for by the promiscuous blending of different independent accounts.

The critics can say plausible things in defence of their hypothesis, and they show surprising adroitness in handling it. But it seems to me that it is clogged with insuperable difficulties which should prevent its acceptance by thoughtful and considerate minds who are not captivated by brilliant novelties, and who are not willing to surrender the truth of the sacred history and the firm basis on which it rests, until some good reason can be given for so doing.

